SAMPLE CRITERIA FOR PARTNERSHIP VALUATION TOOL

In order to use the criteria provided in Section 4.6 of the report, WHD would need to develop a tool that could be used to assess partnerships. The tool would take the criteria and develop a set questions around those criteria for WHD to use in assessing partnerships. In this appendix we provide some potential questions that could be used for this purpose.

The questions in this appendix are written prospectively, reflecting that the questions should be asked before a partnership is formed. WHD should also formulate a set of retrospective questions that assess partnerships that have either come to a close or that have been in operation for some time. ERG suggest that the retrospective questions should simply be rewordings of the prospective questions (e.g., altering the verbs to be past-tense).

In the questions, each response option should be assigned a point value that reflects its relative importance. We suggest selecting a response option (or options) to be the "preferred" or "top" response and then setting the top value at 10 for that response option. The remaining response options for each question should be assigned a point value that reflects its relative importance. For example, under 'target audience,' the question "What are main (direct) target audiences of the partnership?" has four response options: "Youth workers," "Parents of youth workers," "Educators and guidance counselors", "Employers," and "Trade associations." Each should be assigned a point value that reflects how important WHD thinks it is to reach each audience. This might correspond to setting a value of 10 for both youth workers and employers. WHD should then set points for each other response option to reflect a value relative to what is set as the top value.

Questions for Assessing Partnerships

Target audience

> What are main (direct) target audiences of the partnership?
> - ☐ Youth workers
> - ☐ Parents of youth workers
> - ☐ Educators and guidance counselors
> - ☐ Employers
> - ☐ Trade associations

Reach

> How many employers will the partnership realistically be able to reach?
> - ☐ More than 400
> - ☐ Between 200 and 400
> - ☐ Between 50 and 200
> - ☐ Less than 50
> - ☐ No employers are targeted

> What proportion of the targeted employers do you expect the partnership to realistically reach?
> - ☐ More than half
> - ☐ Between one-third and a half
> - ☐ Between 10 percent and one-third
> - ☐ Less than 10 percent
> - ☐ No employers are targeted

➢ How many youth workers will the partnership realistically be able to reach?
  □ More than 3,000
  □ Between 1,000 and 3,000
  □ Between 200 and 1,000
  □ Less than 200
  □ No youth workers are being targeted.

Goal alignment

➢ To what extent do the goals of the partner overlap with the goals of WHD?
  □ Significant overlap
  □ Moderate overlap
  □ Some overlap
  □ No overlap

➢ To what degree has the partner committed resources (time, money, etc.) to meet the partnership?
  □ Significant commitment (will be sufficient to meet the needs of the program)
  □ Moderate commitment
  □ Some commitment
  □ No definitive commitment

Partner influence on target audience(s) [questions should be asked of each target audience]

➢ To what extent does the partner exert influence on the actions of {target audience}?
  □ Significant influence
  □ Moderate influence
  □ Low influence
  □ No influence at this time\

➢ Among {target audience}, how would you describe the reputation of the partner?
  □ Highly respected
  □ Somewhat respected
  □ Not respected/unknown entity

Intervention point

➢ To what extent does the partnership focus on activities that will lead to avoidance of child labor violations?
  □ Primary focus (all or main activities focus on avoidance)
  □ Moderate focus (some activities, but not the primary focus)
  □ Not focused on avoidance activities

Replicability

➢ If successful, to what extent can this partnership be replicated in other contexts (e.g., sectors or areas)?
  □ Easily replicable, could be taken as a whole and implemented in another context/would require almost no work to replicate
  □ Moderately replicable, would require minor rework of some components/would require some work to replicate, but not a significant effort

- ☐ Somewhat replicable, would require significant re-work of main components/would require a significant effort to replicate, but could be done.
- ☐ Not replicable, any re-work would be equivalent to starting over

Sustainability

➢ To what extent does the partner have a person or persons who are dedicated to/motivated by this effort?
- ☐ Partner staff exhibit high dedication/motivation to this partnership
- ☐ Partner staff exhibit moderate dedication/motivation to this partnership
- ☐ Partner staff exhibit low dedication/motivation to this partnership
- ☐ Partner staff exhibit no dedication/motivation to this partnership

➢ What was the origin of this partnership?
- ☐ Partner approached WHD
- ☐ WHD and partner both had a similar idea
- ☐ WHD approached partner